

TNMD010041272026



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : THIRU. M.SAISARAVANAN., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Monday, this the 6th day of July, 2026.

Crl.M.P.No.3060/2026

CNR No.TNMD010041272026

Saranya, W/o.Gunasekaran

... Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,

Oomatchikulam AWP.S. in Cr.No.04/2026

... Respondent/Complainant.

This e-petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.G.Velumani, Advocate for the petitioner and of Public Prosecutor for the State, this court passed the following:

Order

1. Anticipatory Bail application u/s 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Heard both sides.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused submitted that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioner and another in Cr.No.4/2026 for the offences u/s 85 of BNS and 4 of TNPWH Act. The petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged. The petitioner/A2 is the sister of A1. The petitioner got married in the year 2013 itself and settled in Chennai. The marriage between the defacto-complainant and A1 took place in the year 2023. The petitioner is in no way connected with the offences alleged. Since the petitioner is the sister-in-law of the defacto-complainant, she is falsely roped into this case. No similar petition is filed or pending before any superior courts. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of police. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this Court and prayed to allow the petition.

4. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that the defacto-complainant is the wife of A1. A2 is the sister of A1. The marriage between the defacto-complainant and A1 was solemnized in the year 2023. A1 is an alcoholic, who frequently quarrelled with the defacto-complainant demanding additional dowry. Furthermore, he pawned her jewelry and spent the amount. A1 routinely subjected the defacto-complainant to physical torture, resulting in injuries. Both A1 and A2 have refused to return the defacto-complainant's jewelry and the household items gifted at the time of marriage, thereby causing her severe mental agony and subjecting her to cruelty. Investigation is pending and objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner/accused are u/s 85 of BNS and 4 of TNPWH Act. The petitioner/A2 is the sister-in-law of the defacto-complainant and sister of A1. The petitioner/A2 got married and settled in Chennai in the year 2013 itself. The marriage between A1 and the defacto-complainant was solemnized in the year 2023. As per FIR, there is no specific overt act against the petitioner except the allegation that the petitioner/A2 abetted A1. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and High Court time and again insist that the in-laws should not be unnecessarily dragged into the case of dowry harassment. No previous case is brought to the knowledge of this court against the petitioner. Considering all these aspects and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory to the petitioner on conditions.

In the result in the event of arrest or on her surrendering before the Court concerned the petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.V, Madurai subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall surrender before the concerned Court within 15 days from today; failing which, the petition shall stand automatically cancelled.

(ii) After release, the petitioner shall appear and sign before the Inspector of police, respondent police station **daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 30 days.**

(iii) The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and she shall not threaten the witnesses. She shall not induce witnesses and shall not cause hindrance to the pending investigation.

(iv) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(v) If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation officer is within his discretion to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned for cancellation of bail as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **Shaji/Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.**

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 6th day of July, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to

1. The J.M.No.5. Madurai.
2. The Inspector of Police, Oomatchikulam AWP.S.
3. The Petitioner through his counsel.